arXiv:math/0202196v1 [math.DG] 19 Feb 2002

REMARK ABOUT THE SPECTRUM OF THE p-FORM LAPLACIAN UNDER A COLLAPSE WITH CURVATURE BOUNDED BELOW

JOHN LOTT

Abstract. We give a lower bound on the number of small positive eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian in a certain type of collapse with curvature bounded below.

1. Introduction

A general problem in spectral geometry is to estimate the eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian on a closed Riemannian manifold M in terms of the geometry of M. From Hodge theory, the number of zero eigenvalues is $b_p(M)$, the p-th Betti number of M. Hence the issue is to understand the positive eigenvalues. The papers [2], [7] and [8] study the case when one assumes an upper bound on the diameter of the manifold and double-sided bounds on the sectional curvatures. An important phenomenon is the possible appearance of positive eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian that approach zero as a manifold collapses with bounded curvature.

The analysis of [7] and [8] uses the results of Cheeger, Fukaya and Gromov on the geometric structure of manifolds that collapse with double-sided curvature bounds. If one only assumes a lower sectional curvature bound then there are some structure results about collapsing in [4] and [12], but the theory is less developed than in the bounded curvature case.

In this paper we look at the small positive eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian in an example of collapse with curvature bounded below. Namely, suppose that a compact Lie group G acts isometrically on M on the left. Give G a left-invariant Riemannian metric. For $\epsilon > 0$, let ϵG denote G with its Riemannian metric multiplied by ϵ^2. Let M_ϵ denote $M = G\backslash(\epsilon G \times M)$ equipped with the quotient Riemannian metric g_ϵ, where G acts diagonally on $\epsilon G \times M$ on the left. If G is connected then $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} M_\epsilon = G\backslash M$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology, and as ϵ goes to zero, the sectional curvatures of M_ϵ stay uniformly bounded below [12].

For notation, if M is a smooth connected closed manifold with Riemannian metric g, let $\{\lambda_{p,j}(M,g)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ denote the eigenvalues (counted with multiplicity) of the Laplacian on $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^p_{L^2}(M)$.

Theorem 1. *If* $j = \dim\left(\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{H}^p(G\backslash M;\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{H}^p(M;\mathbb{R}))\right)$ *then* $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \lambda_{p,j}(M_\epsilon, g_\epsilon) = 0$.

In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1. The main points of the proof are the use of a certain variational expression for $\lambda_{p,j}(M,g)$, due to Cheeger and Dodziuk [3], and the avoidance of dealing with the detailed orbit structure of the group action. We then look at the example

Date: February 11, 2002.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 58G25; Secondary: 53C23.

Research supported by NSF grant DMS-0072154.

of an S^1-action on S^{2n}, which is the suspension of the Hopf action of S^1 on S^{2n-1}, and show that our results slightly improve those of Takahashi [10]. In Section 3 we make some further remarks.

I thank Junya Takahashi for sending me a copy of his paper.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of G. It acquires an inner product from the left-invariant Riemannian metric on G. Given $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$, let $\mathfrak{X}$ be the corresponding vector field on M. Let $i_{\mathfrak{X}}$ denote interior multiplication by $\mathfrak{X}$.

Let $\Omega^*(M)$ denote the smooth differential forms on M. Let $\Omega^*_{L^2}(M)$ be the L^2-completion of $\Omega^*(M)$. Put

$$\Omega^*_{max}(M) \ = \ \{\omega \in \Omega^*_{L^2}(M) \ : \ d\omega \in \Omega^{*+1}_{L^2}(M)\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $d\omega$ is originally defined distributionally.

Put

$$\Omega^*_G(M) \ = \ \{\omega \in \Omega^*(M) \ : \ g \cdot \omega \ = \ \omega \text{ for all } g \in G\} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\Omega^*_{basic}(M) \ = \ \{\omega \in \Omega^*_G(M) \ : \ i_{\mathfrak{X}}\omega \ = \ 0 \text{ for all } \mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\Omega^*_{G,L^2}(M)$ and $\Omega^*_{basic,L^2}(M)$ be the L^2-completions of $\Omega^*_G(M)$ and $\Omega^*_{basic}(M)$, respectively. Put

$$\Omega^*_{basic,max}(M) \ = \ \{\omega \in \Omega^*_{basic,L^2}(M) \ : \ d\omega \in \Omega^{*+1}_{basic,L^2}(M)\}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $d\omega$ is originally defined distributionally. Then $\Omega^*_{basic,max}(M)$ is a complex.

From [6] and [11], the cohomology of the complex $\Omega^*_{basic}(M)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{H}^*(G\backslash M; \mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 1. *The cohomology of the complex $\Omega^*_{basic,max}(M)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{H}^*(G\backslash M; \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of [11]. The only point to note is that the homotopy operator A used in the Poincaré lemma in [11] sends $\Omega^*_{basic,max}$ to itself. □

The quotient map $p \ : \ \epsilon G \ \times \ M \rightarrow M_\epsilon$ defines a principal G-bundle. Pullback gives an isomorphism $p^* \ : \ \Omega^*(M_\epsilon) \ \cong \ \Omega^*_{basic}(\epsilon G \ \times \ M)$. The parallelism of G gives an isomorphism

$$\Omega^*(\epsilon G \ \times \ M) \ \cong \ C^\infty(G) \ \otimes \ \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \ \otimes \ \Omega^*(M). \tag{2.5}$$

Taking G-invariants gives isomorphisms

$$\Omega^*_G(\epsilon G \ \times \ M) \ \rightarrow \ (C^\infty(G) \ \otimes \ \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \ \otimes \ \Omega^*(M))^G \ \stackrel{\beta}{\rightarrow} \ \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \ \otimes \ \Omega^*(M), \tag{2.6}$$

where β comes from the map which sends $\sum_k f_k \ \otimes \ \eta_k \ \otimes \ \omega_k \in C^\infty(G) \ \otimes \ \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \ \otimes \ \Omega^*(M)$ to $\sum_i f_k(e) \, \eta_k \ \otimes \ \omega_k \in \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \ \otimes \ \Omega^*(M)$.

Let $\{\mathfrak{x}_j\}_{j=1}^{dim(G)}$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. For $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$, let $e(\mathfrak{x}^*)$ denote exterior multiplication by $\mathfrak{x}^*$ on $\Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*)$.

Lemma 2. *There is an isomorphism of complexes* $\mathcal{I} : \Omega^*(M) \to \Omega^*_{basic}(\epsilon G \times M) \subset \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \Omega^*(M)$ *given by*

$$\mathcal{I}(\sigma) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{dim(G)} \left(1 - e(\mathfrak{x}_j^*) \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}_j}\right) \right) (1 \otimes \sigma)$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{dim(G)} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \le j_1 < \ldots < j_k \le dim(G)} (\mathfrak{x}_{j_k}^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathfrak{x}_{j_1}^*) \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}_{j_1}} \ldots i_{\mathfrak{x}_{j_k}} \sigma. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. If $\sum_k f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes \omega_k \in (C^\infty(G) \otimes \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \Omega^*(M))^G$ is G-basic then for $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$, we also have

$$\sum_k \left(f_k \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}} \omega_k \right) = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Then

$$\sum_k \left(f_k(e)\, i_{\mathfrak{x}} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} f_k(e)\, \eta_k \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}} \omega_k \right) = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

i.e. if $\sum_k \eta_k \otimes \omega_k$ lies in the image of β restricted to $\Omega^*_{basic}(\epsilon G \times M)$ then

$$\sum_k \left(i_{\mathfrak{x}} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} \eta_k \otimes i_{\mathfrak{x}} \omega_k \right) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

It follows that $\sum_k \eta_k \otimes \omega_k$ can be written as $\mathcal{I}(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in \Omega^*(M)$. Thus $\mathcal{I}$ is surjective. It is clearly injective.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{I}$ is a morphism of complexes. Let d^{inv} denote the (finite-dimensional) differential on $\Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*)$. If an element of $\Omega^*_G(\epsilon G \times M)$ is represented as $\sum_k f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes \omega_k \in C^\infty(G) \otimes \Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \Omega^*(M)$ then the G-invariance implies that for $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$\sum_k (\mathfrak{x} f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{x}} \omega_k) = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

The differential of $\sum_k f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes \omega_k$ is represented by

$$\sum_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^{dim(G)} \mathfrak{x}_j f_k \otimes e(\mathfrak{x}_j^*) \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + f_k \otimes d^{inv} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes d\omega_k \right). \tag{2.12}$$

From (2.11), this equals

$$\sum_k \left(- \sum_{j=1}^{dim(G)} f_k \otimes e(\mathfrak{x}_j^*) \eta_k \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \omega_k + f_k \otimes d^{inv} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} f_k \otimes \eta_k \otimes d\omega_k \right). \tag{2.13}$$

Using β, it follows that the induced differential on $\Lambda^*(\mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes \Omega^*(M)$ sends $\sum_k \eta_k \otimes \omega_k$ to

$$\sum_k \left(- \sum_{j=1}^{dim(G)} e(\mathfrak{x}_j^*) \eta_k \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \omega_k + d^{inv} \eta_k \otimes \omega_k + (-1)^{|\eta_k|} \eta_k \otimes d\omega_k \right). \tag{2.14}$$

One can check that when this acts on $\mathcal{I}(\sigma)$, the result is $\mathcal{I}(d\sigma)$. Thus $\mathcal{I}$ is an isomorphism of complexes. □

In fact, under our identifications, $\mathcal{I}$ is the same as p^*.

Let M^{reg} be the union of the principal orbits for the G-action on M. It is a dense open subset of M with full measure. If $m \in M^{reg}$, let $H \subset G$ be its isotropy subgroup, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$. Define $\alpha : \mathfrak{g} \to T_m M$ by $\alpha(\mathfrak{x}) = \mathfrak{X}_m$. It passes to an injection $\overline{\alpha} : \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h} \to T_m M$. For $\epsilon \geq 0$, put $\rho_\epsilon(m) = \det{}^{1/2}(\epsilon^2 \, \mathrm{Id.}\big|_{\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}} + \overline{\alpha}^* \, \overline{\alpha})$. If $m \notin M^{reg}$, put $\rho_\epsilon(m) = 0$. Note that for $\epsilon > 0$, $\rho_\epsilon^{-1}(m) < \rho_0^{-1}(m)$.

Lemma 3. $\rho_0^{-1} \in L^1(M, d\mathrm{vol})$.

Proof. If $m \in M^{reg}$ then up to an overall constant, $\rho_0(m)$ is the volume of the orbit $G \cdot m$. Then $\int_{M^{reg}} \rho_0^{-1}(m) \, d\mathrm{vol}(m)$ is proportionate to the volume of $G \backslash M^{reg} \subset G \backslash M$, which is seen to be finite. □

Let $\{\mathfrak{x}_j\}_{j=1}^{dim(G)}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Lemma 4. *For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a positive constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that $\Omega^*(M_\epsilon)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\Omega^*(M)$ with the new norm*

$$\| \omega \|_\epsilon^2 = C(\epsilon) \int_M \rho_\epsilon^{-1}(m) \left(|\omega(m)|_M^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{dim(G)} \epsilon^{-2k} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq dim(G)} |i_{\mathfrak{x}_{j_1}} \ldots i_{\mathfrak{x}_{j_k}} \omega(m)|_M^2 \right) d\mathrm{vol}(m). \tag{2.15}$$

Proof. We can compute the norm squared of $\omega \in \Omega^*(M_\epsilon)$ by taking the local norm squared of $p^*\omega$ on $\epsilon G \times M^{reg}$, dividing by the function which assigns to $(g, m) \in \epsilon G \times M^{reg}$ the volume of the orbit $G \cdot (g, m)$, and integrating over $\epsilon G \times M^{reg}$. If $m \in M^{reg}$ then the relative volume of $G \cdot (g, m)$ is

$$\det{}^{1/2}(\epsilon^2 \, \mathrm{Id.}\big|_{\mathfrak{g}} + \alpha^* \alpha) = \epsilon^{dim(H)} \, \rho_\epsilon(m). \tag{2.16}$$

The map β of (2.6) is an isometry, up to a constant. As $\{\epsilon^{-1} \, \mathfrak{x}_j\}_{j=1}^{dim(G)}$ is an orthonormal basis for $T_e(\epsilon G)$, the lemma follows from Lemma 2. □

Proof of Theorem 1 : Put $\lambda_{p,j}(\epsilon) = \lambda_{p,j}(M_\epsilon, g_\epsilon)$. From [3],

$$\lambda_{p,j}(\epsilon) = \inf_V \sup_{\eta \in V - 0} \sup_{\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta)} \frac{\| \eta \|_\epsilon^2}{\| \theta \|_\epsilon^2}, \tag{2.17}$$

where V ranges over j-dimensional subspaces of $\mathrm{Im}\,(d : \Omega^{p-1}(M) \to \Omega^p(M))$, and $\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta) \subset \Omega^{p-1}(M)$.

Take $j = \dim\left(\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{H}^p(G\backslash M; \mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{H}^p(M; \mathbb{R}))\right)$. From Lemma 1, the inclusion of complexes $\Omega^*_{basic}(M) \to \Omega^*_{basic,max}(M)$ induces an isomorphism on cohomology. Then there is a j-dimensional subspace V of

$$\mathrm{Ker}\left(d : \Omega^p_{basic}(M) \to \Omega^{p+1}_{basic}(M)\right) \cap \mathrm{Im}\left(d : \Omega^{p-1}(M) \to \Omega^p(M)\right) \tag{2.18}$$

such that if $\eta \in V - 0$ then $\eta \notin \mathrm{Im}\left(d : \Omega^{p-1}_{basic,max}(M) \to \Omega^p_{basic,L^2}(M)\right)$. We claim that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{\eta \in V - 0} \sup_{\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta)} \frac{\| \eta \|_\epsilon^2}{\| \theta \|_\epsilon^2} = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

This will suffice to prove the theorem.

Suppose that (2.19) is not true. Then there are a constant $c > 0$, a sequence $\{\epsilon_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{R}^+$ approaching zero, a sequence $\{\eta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ in $V - 0$ and a sequence $\{\theta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ in $\Omega^{p-1}(M)$ such that for all r, $d\theta_r = \eta_r$ and

$$\frac{\| \eta_r \|_{\epsilon_r}^2}{\| \theta_r \|_{\epsilon_r}^2} \geq c. \tag{2.20}$$

Doing a Fourier decomposition of θ_r with respect to G, the ratio in (2.20) does not decrease if we replace θ_r by its G-invariant component. Thus we may assume that θ_r is G-invariant.

Without loss of generality, we can replace the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\epsilon}$ of (2.15) by the same norm divided by $C(\epsilon)$, which we again denote by $\| \cdot \|_{\epsilon}$. As η_r is smooth on M, it follows from Lemma 3 that the function $\rho_0^{-1}(m) \, |\eta_r(m)|_M^2$ is integrable on M. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\int_M \rho_0^{-1}(m) \, |\eta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) = 1. \tag{2.21}$$

As $\{\eta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ lies in the sphere of a finite-dimensional space, there will be a subsequence, which we relabel as $\{\eta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$, that converges smoothly to some $\eta_\infty \in V - 0$.

From (2.20),

$$\begin{aligned} \| \theta_r \|_{\epsilon_r}^2 &\leq c^{-1} \| \eta_r \|_{\epsilon_r}^2 = c^{-1} \int_M \rho_{\epsilon_r}^{-1}(m) \, |\eta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) \\ &\leq c^{-1} \int_M \rho_0^{-1}(m) \, |\eta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) = c^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

For large r,

$$\int_M |\theta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) \leq (\inf_M \rho_{\epsilon_r}^{-1})^{-1} \int_M \rho_{\epsilon_r}^{-1}(m) \, |\theta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) \leq (\inf_M \rho_1^{-1})^{-1} \, c^{-1}. \tag{2.23}$$

We now work with respect to the metric g on M. By weak-compactness of the unit ball in L^2, there is a subsequence of $\{\theta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$, which we relabel as $\{\theta_r\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$, that converges weakly in L^2 to some $\theta_\infty \in \Omega_{G,L^2}^{p-1}(M)$. Then for $\sigma \in \Omega^p(M)$,

$$\langle \sigma, \eta_\infty \rangle_M - \langle d^*\sigma, \theta_\infty \rangle_M = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\langle \sigma, \eta_r \rangle_M - \langle d^*\sigma, \theta_r \rangle_M) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \langle \sigma, \eta_r - d\theta_r \rangle_M = 0. \tag{2.24}$$

Thus $\theta_\infty \in \Omega_{max}^{p-1}(M)$ and $d\theta_\infty = \eta_\infty$.

From (2.22), we also obtain that for each $1 \leq j \leq \dim(G)$,

$$\int_M |i_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \theta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) \leq (\inf_M \rho_{\epsilon_r}^{-1})^{-1} \int_M \rho_{\epsilon_r}^{-1}(m) \, |i_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \eta_r(m)|_M^2 \, d\mathrm{vol}(m) \leq (\inf_M \rho_1^{-1})^{-1} \, c^{-1} \, \epsilon_r^2. \tag{2.25}$$

Then for all $\sigma \in \Omega^{p-2}(M)$,

$$\langle \sigma, i_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \theta_\infty \rangle_M = \langle (i_{\mathfrak{x}_j})^* \sigma, \theta_\infty \rangle_M = \lim_{r \to \infty} \langle (i_{\mathfrak{x}_j})^* \sigma, \theta_r \rangle_M = \lim_{r \to \infty} \langle \sigma, i_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \theta_r \rangle_M = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Thus $i_{\mathfrak{x}_j} \theta_\infty = 0$ and $\theta_\infty \in \Omega_{basic,max}^{p-1}(M)$. Hence $\eta_\infty \in \mathrm{Im} \left(d : \Omega_{basic,max}^{p-1}(M) \to \Omega_{basic,L^2}^{p}(M) \right)$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Example : Let $G = U(1)$ act on $M = S^{2n}$ by the suspension of the Hopf action of $U(1)$ on S^{2n-1}. Then $G\backslash M = U(1)\backslash S^{2n}$ is the suspension of $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$. One finds that $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{H}^p(G\backslash M;\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{H}^p(M;\mathbb{R}))$ is nonzero if and only if $p \in \{3, 5, \dots, 2n-1\}$. From Theorem 1, as $\epsilon \to 0$ there are small eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian on $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$ for $p \in \{3, 5, \dots, 2n-1\}$. From the Hodge decomposition, there will also be small eigenvalues of the p-form Laplacian on $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d^*)} \subset \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$ for $p \in \{2, 4, \dots, 2n-2\}$. Then using Hodge duality, one concludes that there are small eigenvalues on
1. $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d^*)} \subset \Omega^1_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$,
2. $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$ and $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d^*)} \subset \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$ for $p \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots, 2n-3, 2n-2\}$, and
3. $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^{2n-1}_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$.
This slightly sharpens [10, Theorem 1.2]. Note that from eigenvalue estimates for the scalar Laplacian [1], there are no small eigenvalues on $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d^*)} \subset \Omega^0_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$, $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^1_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$, $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d^*)} \subset \Omega^{2n-1}_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$ or $\overline{\mathrm{Im}(d)} \subset \Omega^{2n}_{L^2}(M_\epsilon)$.

3. Remarks

1. In the case of a locally-free torus action, there is some intersection between Theorem 1 and the results of [2], [7] and [8]. In [8] one deals with the cohomology of a certain $\mathbb{Z}$-graded sheaf $\mathrm{H}^*(A'_{[0]})$ on the limit space X. In the case of a collapsing coming from a locally-free torus action, Theorem 1 is a statement about the case $* = 0$, when the sheaf $\mathrm{H}^0(A'_{[0]})$ is the constant $\mathbb{R}$-sheaf on X. Of course, the result of Theorem 1 will generally not give all of the small positive eigenvalues that arise in a collapse. As seen in the Example, one can obtain more small eigenvalues just from Hodge duality.

2. Theorem 1 indicates that the relevant cohomology of the limit space is the ordinary cohomology, as opposed for example to the L^2-cohomology. This is consistent with the results of [8] in the bounded curvature case.

3. If G has positive dimension and acts effectively on M then Theorem 1 describes small positive eigenvalues in a collapsing situation. In some noncollapsing situations, one can show that small eigenvalues do not exist. Here is one such criterion.

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a collection of closed n-dimensional Riemannian manifolds, with $n > 0$. Give $\mathcal{M}$ the Lipschitz metric, coming from biLipschitz homeomorphisms. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ can be covered by a finite number of metric balls. For $p \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, n]$ and $j \geq 0$, there are positive numbers $a_{p,j}$ and $A_{p,j}$ so that if $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}$ then $a_{p,j} \leq \lambda_{p,j}(M, g) \leq A_{p,j}$, and $\lim_{j\to\infty} a_{p,j} = \infty$.*

Proof. Suppose first that for some p and j, there is no upper bound on $\lambda_{p,j}(M, g)$ as (M, g) ranges over $\mathcal{M}$. Then there is a sequence $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{M}$ with the property that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_{p,j}(M_i, g_i) = \infty$. A subsequence of $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$, which we relabel as $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$, will have finite distance from some $(M_\infty, g_\infty) \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there are a number $\epsilon \geq 0$ and a sequence of biLipschitz homeomorphisms $h_i : M_\infty \to M_i$ so that for all i,

$$e^{-\epsilon}\, g_\infty \leq h_i^* g_i \leq e^{\epsilon}\, g_\infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Here $h_i^* g_i$ is a Lipschitz metric on M_∞. From Hodge theory,

$$\lambda_{p,j}(M_i, g_i) \;=\; \inf_V \sup_{\eta \in V - 0} \sup_{\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta)} \frac{\| \eta \|^2_{M_i}}{\| \theta \|^2_{M_i}}, \tag{3.2}$$

where V ranges over j-dimensional subspaces of $\mathrm{Im}\left(d : \Omega^{p-1}_{max}(M_i) \to \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_i)\right)$, and $\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta) \subset \Omega^{p-1}_{max}(M_i)$. By naturality,

$$\lambda_{p,j}(M_i, g_i) \;=\; \inf_V \sup_{\eta \in V - 0} \sup_{\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta)} \frac{\| \eta \|^2_{h_i^* g_i}}{\| \theta \|^2_{h_i^* g_i}}, \tag{3.3}$$

where V ranges over j-dimensional subspaces of $\mathrm{Im}\left(d : \Omega^{p-1}_{max}(M_\infty) \to \Omega^p_{L^2}(M_\infty)\right)$, and $\theta \in d^{-1}(\eta) \subset \Omega^{p-1}_{max}(M_\infty)$.

As in [3], it follows from (3.1) and (3.3) that there is a positive integer J which only depends on n so that

$$e^{-\,J\epsilon}\, \lambda_{p,j}(M_\infty, g_\infty) \;\le\; \lambda_{p,j}(M_i, g_i) \;\le\; e^{J\epsilon}\, \lambda_{p,j}(M_\infty, g_\infty). \tag{3.4}$$

This contradicts the assumption that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_{p,j}(M_i, g_i) \;=\; \infty$.

Now suppose that it is not true that there is a uniform lower bound $a_{p,j}$ on $\{\lambda_{p,j}(M, g)\}_{(M,g)\in\mathcal{M}}$ with the property that $\lim_{j\to\infty} a_{p,j} \;=\; \infty$. Then there are a number $C \;>\; 0$, a sequence $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and a sequence of integers $\{j_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} j_i \;=\; \infty$ and for each i, $\lambda_{p,j_i}(M_i, g_i) \;\le\; C$. Take a subsequence $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and an (M_∞, g_∞) as before. Then for each j,

$$\lambda_{p,j}(M_\infty, g_\infty) \;\le\; \sup_{i\to\infty} \lambda_{p,j_i}(M_\infty, g_\infty) \;\le\; \sup_{i\to\infty} e^{J\epsilon}\, \lambda_{p,j_i}(M_i, g_i) \;\le\; e^{J\epsilon}\, C. \tag{3.5}$$

This contradicts the discreteness of the spectrum of the p-form Laplacian on (M_∞, g_∞). □

Proposition 1 shows that in a certain sense, one has uniform eigenvalue bounds in the noncollapsing case. It seems possible that for a given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v, D \;>\; 0$, the collection $\mathcal{M}$ of connected n-dimensional Riemannian manifolds (M, g) with sectional curvatures greater than K, volume greater than v and diameter less than D satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 1. It is known that there is a finite number of homeomorphism types in $\mathcal{M}$ [5]. On the other hand, the analogous space of metrics defined with Ricci curvature, instead of sectional curvature, will generally not satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 1 [9].

References

[1] P. Bérard, "From Vanishing Theorems to Estimating Theorems: the Bochner Technique Revisited", Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 19, p. 371-406 (1988)

[2] B. Colbois and G. Courtois, "A Note on the First Nonzero Eigenvalue of the Laplacian Acting on p-Forms", Manuscripta Math. 68, p. 143-160 (1990)

[3] J. Dodziuk, "Eigenvalues of the Laplacian on Forms", Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 85, p. 437-443 (1982)

[4] K. Fukaya and T. Yamaguchi, "The Fundamental Groups of Almost Nonnegatively Curved Manifolds", Ann. of Math. 136, p. 253-333 (1992)

[5] K. Grove, P. Petersen and J. Wu, "Geometric Finiteness Theorems via Controlled Topology", Invent. Math. 99, p. 205-213 (1990)

[6] J. Koszul, "Sur Certains Groupes de Transformations de Lie", in Géométrie differentielle, Colloques Internationaux du CNRS, Strasbourg, p. 137-141 (1953)

[7] J. Lott, "Collapsing and the Differential Form Laplacian : The Case of a Smooth Limit Space", to appear, Duke Math. J., http://www.math.lsa.umich.edu/~ lott
[8] J. Lott, "Collapsing and the Differential Form Laplacian : The Case of a Singular Limit Space", preprint, http://www.math.lsa.umich.edu/~ lott
[9] G. Perelman, "Construction of Manifolds of Positive Ricci Curvature with Big Volume and Large Betti Numbers", in Comparison Geometry, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. 30, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, p. 157-163 (1997)
[10] J. Takahashi, "Small Eigenvalues on p-Forms for Collapsing of the Even Dimensional Spheres", preprint (2001)
[11] A. Verona, "A de Rham Type Theorem for Orbit Spaces", Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 104, p. 300-302 (1988)
[12] T. Yamaguchi, "Collapsing and Pinching Under a Lower Curvature Bound", Ann. of Math. 133, p. 317-357 (1991)

Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109, USA
E-mail address: lott@math.lsa.umich.edu